APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,970	02/11/2000	Steven P. Capps	130718.01	5937

22971　　7590　　06/15/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 May 2006*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-43,73 and 74* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-43,73 and 74* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 5/10/06.

Claims 1-43,73 and 74 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 25, 29, 37, and 74 are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 8-43, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Swartz et al. (US 2003/0028368) in view of Friedman et al. US 6,167,455.

As per claim 1, Swartz et al. teaches in a computer system having graphical user interface

and a user interface selection device, a method of providing the user interface for selection

therefrom, comprising:

maintaining information about a sequence of places visited on the computer system by a

user, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications; (See Swartz:

paragraph 0072; Examiner interprets chronological order to be a sequence of places visited)

while displaying a first application of the plurality, (See Swartz et al: paragraph 0002,

Examiner interprets the operating system to be the first application of the plurality. Snapshot

Navigator Menu is inherently a part of a display of the operating system) providing a first

selection mechanism associated with the sequence of places; (See Swartz et al: figure 3, item 303, paragraph 0029, paragraph 0037; Examiner interprets the Snapshot navigator menu to be a first selection mechanism, and retrieve sequence as a chronological order and the sequence according to the order in which they are visited)

in response to a user-input signal indicative of a selection of first selection mechanism, navigating to a place in the sequence that is in a second application of the plurality.(See Swartz paragraph 0040; Examiner interprets selecting of subsequent application by using a mouse to be a navigating to a place in the sequence that is in a second application of the plurality.

However, Swartz fails to teach automatically tracking and adding to the sequence when the user visits the places, where the maintaining is performed such that multiple places visited using a same application can exist in the sequence, and where the places in the sequence are order according to the order in which they are visited.

Friedman teaches automatically tracking the sequence of the places visited by the user, where the maintaining is performed such that multiple places visited using a same application can exist in the sequence, and where the places in the sequence are order according to the order in which they are visited. (column 4, lines 1-column 5, lines 7, and column 1, lines 10-20)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Friedman's teaching with method of Swartz in order to provide a mechanism by which the user can perform an action, and undo that action if the result is dissatisfactory or redo the action.

As per claim 2, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swartz further teaches wherein navigating to a place comprises navigating to a previous place in the sequence. (See Swartz paragraph 0040)

As per claim 8, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 7. Swart teaches wherein displaying the representation of the information comprises displaying a recent places page comprising, for each of the places, a place link associated with the place. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

As per claim 9, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 8. Swart teaches the method further comprising:

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of n of the place links, navigating to the place associated with the one place link. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

As per claim 10, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swart teaches a method further comprising:

maintaining information about applications that have been displayed on the computer system; and (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

displaying for each of the applications, according to a information about applications, a representation of the application. (See Swartz paragraphs 0030; Examiner interprets the thumbnails to be a representation of the application)

As per claim 11, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 10. Swart teaches a method further comprising:

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of one of the representations, taking action

with respect to the application associated with the representation. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-

0035)

As per claim 12, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 10. Swart teaches

wherein each of the representations for each of the applications comprises a representation of a

place most recently visited by the application. (See Swartz: paragraph 0072; Examiner

interprets chronological order to be a representation of the most recently visited the applications)

As per claim 13, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 12. Swart teaches

further comprising:

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of a representation of a most recently

visited place, displaying the most recently visited place in the respective application. (See

Swartz: paragraph 0072)

As per claim 14, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 10. Swart further

teaches comprising:

in response to a signal indicative of a first selection of one of the representations

displaying the application associated with the representation; (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

and

in response to a signal indicative of a second selection of one of the representations,

displaying places that have been displayed in the application. (See Swartz paragraph 0040)

As per claim 15, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 14. Swart further teaches wherein the second selection comprises providing a menu that displays places that have been displayed in the application. (See Swartz et al: figure 3, item 303, paragraph 0029)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is of the same scopes claim 12. Supra

As per claim 17, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swart further teaches the method comprising:

maintaining information about each of the places, a information including a reference to page code used to implement the place. (figure 3, item "# slides: 4", Examiner interprets Slides # to be page code)

As per claim 18, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swart further teaches method wherein the information about each of the places includes a reference to data that is combined with the page code to display the place. (figure 3, item "# slides: 4", Examiner interprets Slides # to be page code)

As per claim 19, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 18. Swart further teaches method wherein the information about each of the places includes view state information for the place. (figure 3 , item "1/28/98 4:58pm")

As per claim 20, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swart further teaches the method is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions. (See Swart paragraph 0005-0009)

As per claim 21, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1. Swart further teaches wherein in the second application includes display information associated therewith, and further comprising overriding the display information so as to display the place in the second application

in accordance with drawing functions provided by the user interface. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

As per claim 22, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 21, wherein overriding comprises suppressing the display information. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

As per claim 23, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 21, w rein overriding comprises rerouting the display information to the drawing functions of the shell component. (See Swartz paragraph 0043; It is inherent when the focus is changed the interface is redrawn with the shell component)

As per claim 24, Swart and Friedman teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first application is displayed in a first application window, and wherein navigating to the place in the second application comprises displaying the place in a second application window that is not the same as the first application window. (figure 3, item 305)

As per claim 25, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. Supra

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, it is of the same scope as claim 8. Supra

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 25, it is of the same scope as claim 9. Supra

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 25, it is of the same scope as claim 20. Supra

As per claim 29, Swart and Friedman teach in a computer system having a graphical user interface and a user interface selection device, a method of providing the user interface for selection therefrom, comprising:

maintaining information about applications configured to run on the computer system; (See Swartz: paragraph 0072; Examiner interprets chronological order to be a sequence of places visited)

displaying for each of the applications, according to the information about applications, a representation corresponding to the application, (See Swartz et al: figure 3, item 303, paragraph 0029; Examiner interprets the Snapshot navigator menu to be a first selection mechanism) such that the representation is displayed as part of at least one of the applications and in response to a signal indicative of a selection of one of the representations, (See Swartz et al: paragraph 0002, The operating system is a application. Snapshot Navigator Menu is inherently a part of a display of the operating system) displaying places that have been visited by the application. (See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

As per claim 30-31, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope as claim 12-13 respectively. Supra

As per claim 32, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 29. Swartz further teaches wherein displaying places that have been visited by the application comprises opening a menu that displays places that have been displayed in the application. (See Swartz paragraphs 0035)

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope as claim 16.

Supra

As per claim 34, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 29. Swartz further

teaches the representations of the applications are displayed on a selection bar. (See Swartz

figure 3, item 301)

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope as claim 12.

Supra

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope as claim 20.

Supra

As per claim 37, Swartz and Friedman teach in a computer system, a method of

navigating between places that have been visited by the computer system, comprising:

maintaining information about a place, the information on including:

a reference to first executable code for displaying the place; (See Swart paragraph 0005-

0009)and

a reference to a data object that is bound with the executable code to display the place;

(See Swartz paragraphs 0032-0035)

altering the data object in a second executable code as to form an altered data object; and

in response to a request for the place, binding the altered data object and the first

application (See Swartz paragraph 0043)

executable code and displaying an altered place. (See Swartz paragraph 0043)

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 19.

Supra

As per claim 39, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 37. Swartz further teaches where in the altered data object includes state information, and wherein the altered place is displayed according to the state information. (See Swartz paragraph 0043)

As per claim 40, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 37. Swartz further teaches wherein the altered place is displayed according to a view state registry. (See Swartz paragraph 0043)

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 37. it is of the same scope as claim 20. Supra

As per claim 42, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 37. Swartz further teaches wherein the reference to the data object comprises a moniker. (See Swartz paragraph 0030; Examiner interprets filename to be a moniker)

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 20. Supra

As per claim 74, it is of the same scope as claim 1. Supra.

Claim 3-7 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz (US 2001/0028368) in view of Friedman et al. US 6,167,455 further in view Aragon (US 6,055,327).

As per claim 3, Swartz and Friedman teach the method of claim 2. However, he fails to teach where in the first selection mechanism comprises a back button.

Aragon teaches using a back button to navigate through a list documents. (See Aragon col. 16, lines 30-45)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Aragon's

teaching with method of Swartz and Friedman in order to allow user to navigate the documents

without using a mouse.

As per claim 4, Swartz teaches the method of claim 2. However, he fails teaches

furthermore comprising: displaying, along with the display of the first application, a second

selection mechanism associated with the sequence of places according to the information, the

selection of which navigates to the next place in the sequence of places.

Aragon teaches using a back button and a forward button to navigate through a list

documents. (See Aragon: col. 16, lines 30-45)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Aragon's

teaching with method of Swartz and Friedman in order to allow user to navigate the documents

without using a mouse.

As per claim 5, Swartz and Friedman and Aragon teach the method of claim 3. Aragon

further teaches wherein the second selection mechanism comprises a forward button. (See

Aragon: col. 16, lines 30-45)

As per claim 6, Swartz and Friedman and Aragon teach the method of claim 5. Aragon

further teaches when in the first selection mechanism comprises a back button. (See Aragon:

col. 16, lines 30-45)

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, it is of the same scope as claim 4. Supra

As per claim 73, which is dependent on claim 1, it is o the same scope as the combination

of claims 3 and 5. Supra.

Response To Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43,73 and 74 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERV,   ᴬMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100